



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

For the present, we shall limit our inquiries to two of the most conspicuous writers in the present century—Dr. Milner and Cardinal Wiseman.

We have already disposed of two of the principal authorities which are quoted by those distinguished writers, in another article, in our present number—the spurious Homily of St. Athanasius, and the spurious Epistle of St. Basil to Julian the Apostate, to which we beg to refer our readers—p. 84.

Bishop Milner, in his 35th letter, in the “*End of Religious Controversy*,” page 353, cites but one genuine passage in any way bearing on the point; but it is one entitled to the greatest weight, if truly stated, being no less than that of JUSTIN MARTYR, whom Dr. Milner represents as writing thus—

“We venerate and worship the angelic host and the spirits of the prophets, teaching others as we ourselves have been taught.” Surely, exclaims the reader, this is worth all you have said on the other side; for it shows that Justin Martyr attests that the Christians of his time, only forty years after the death of St. John the Apostle, venerated and worshipped both the angelic host and the spirits of the departed prophets; nay, more, attests that they had been taught so to do by their predecessors, which brings the testimony up to the very lifetime of St. John!

What, however, will our good readers think of the honesty and accuracy of Dr. Milner, who thus tries to end controversy on the subject, when we show them, by reference to the original, which Dr. Milner avoids, of course, that the passage is not only a grossly garbled one, but clearly mistranslated, and that Justin Martyr, in fact, never said any such thing as Dr. Milner imputes to him.

The passage referred to, and intended to be cited by Dr. Milner, occurs in Justin's first Apology, where having stated, that the Christians could never be induced to worship the demons, whom the heathens worshipped and invoked, he proceeds thus—“Whence also we are called Atheists (men without God); and we confess that, with regard to such supposed gods, we are Atheists, but not so with regard to the most true God, the Father of justice and temperance, and of the other virtues, without any mixture of evil. But both Him and the Son, who came from Him, and taught these things to us, and the host of the other good angels accompanying and made like to Him, and the PROPHETIC SPIRIT, we reverence and worship, honouring them in reason and truth; and, without grudging, delivering the doctrine to every one who is willing to learn as we were taught.”*

Now, whatever doubt a Greek scholar might possibly entertain as to the true translation of this passage in other respects, as to which we shall say a word presently, how any man of Milner's pretensions could have dared to transmute ΠΝΕΥΜΑ τὸ προφητικόν, (the prophetic Spirit of God, worshipped by the primitive Christians, as He is still, as the third person of the Blessed Trinity), into the disembodied spirits of the prophets, is somewhat amazing! But what will not those who value short-lived victory more than permanent truth venture upon, in the vain hope that the ignorance of their readers may save them from the exposure they merit?†

We admit that there is some ambiguity in the other part of the passage, and are aware, as Dr. Milner must also have been, that the ablest critics in the Roman Church are much divided as to the proper translation of the clause relating to the angels; some translating it as we do, “Him [God] and his Son who came from him, and taught us and the army of good angels those things, and the Holy Spirit we venerate and adore;” and others, “Him and his Son who came from him, and taught us those things, and the army of good angels and the Holy Spirit, we venerate and adore.” The former making the word “taught” govern the words, “the army of the other good angels,” while the latter makes the words, “revere and worship” govern the word, “angels.” Supposing, however, each of these constructions to be possible grammatically, that the latter cannot be the true interpretation, will, we think, be clear to any one who plainly and closely considers the matter. To suppose it, would be to impute to Christians the practice of paying to the host of angels, the selfsame reverence, worship, and honour, which we pay to the Holy Trinity, the Supreme Father, His ever Blessed Son, and the Holy Spirit, and even placing the angels before the third person of the Trinity. All will revolt from such an interpretation, as not only impious, but contrary to the principles professed by the most celebrated Roman Catholic writers; and every candid man must, we think, admit, that if Justin Martyr had intended to re-

present the holy angels as objects of religious worship (which in no other passage of his writings is there the slightest trace of), he would have selected some more appropriate place for so stating, and would not so violently have thrust the mention of them among the Persons of the ever blessed Trinity, assigning to them a place between the second and third Persons of the eternal hypostatic union!

Feeling this strongly, and anxious to avoid the charge of impiety, some writers (and, among others, the Benedictine editor of Justin)† have attempted to draw a distinction between the two verbs in this passage, “reverence and worship,” alleging that the lower degree of “reverence” expressed by the latter, applies to the angels; whilst the former verb, implying the higher degree of worship, alone relates to the Godhead. But this distinction rests on a false assumption; for the two words (σεβόμεθα) we reverence, and (προσκυνούμεν) we worship, are used equally to convey the idea of the highest religious worship, as is familiar to every scholar, who has studied the Septuagint and the Greek Testament.‡

In determining the true meaning of an obscure passage, grammatically susceptible of two different acceptations, the author himself is often his own best interpreter; and if he has expressed, in another place, the same leading sentiment, without the same obscurity, and free from all doubt, surely, the light borrowed from that passage ought to be used to fix the sense of the ambiguous one, and establish the author's consistency.

Now, Justin, in the very same treatise, a few passages further on, again defends the Christians against the same charge of being Atheists, and on the selfsame ground—first, “that they worship the Father, who is maker of all; secondly, the Son, proceeding from Him; and, thirdly, the Holy Ghost.” In both cases he refers to the same attributes of the Son, as the teacher of Christian truth, and of the Holy Ghost, as the Prophetic Spirit. The following extracts are the only parts necessary for our present purpose—“Who of sound mind will not confess that we are not Atheists, reverencing, as we do, the Maker of the universe, and Him who taught us true things, and who was born for this purpose—Jesus Christ crucified under Pontius Pilate. . . . Instructed, as we are, that He is the Son of the true God, and holding Him in the second place; and the Prophetic Spirit in the third order, we, with reason, honour.”§ In which passage he makes no mention or allusion whatever to the angels, either before or after the Holy Spirit.

We would also, in confirmation of this view, refer our readers to another passage in the same treatise, No. 17, in which Justin distinctly says, “We adore God alone.” (Θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνούμεν.)§

We have no doubt, therefore, that the true meaning of the passage, cited in so unfair and garbled a manner (to say the least of it) by Dr. Milner, in his “*End of Controversy*,” is as follows—“Honouring in reason and truth, we reverence and worship Him, the Father of Righteousness, and the Son (who proceeds from Him; and instructed in those things both ourselves, and the host of the true good angels following Him, and made like unto Him), and the Prophetic Spirit”—in which interpretation we follow the learned Grabe and Langus, entitled the interpreter of Justin, and other eminent writers.¶ (See S. Justini Apologia Prima cum Latina Joannis Langi versione. Edit. a J. E. Grabe, Oxoniae, 1700, p. 11.)

We have now, we think, at least, said enough to satisfy our readers that Dr. Milner's version of the passage is not to be depended on, and that Justin Martyr cannot be considered an authority for the invocation of Angels. As to the invocation of Saints, there is not a suggestion, we venture to assert, from one end of his work to the other.

We had intended to proceed in our present number with another great controversial writer, Cardinal Wiseman, who has, in several articles, attempted to defend the practice of saint-worship; but this would embark us in a disputation too long for the state of our pages, and may, we think, be judiciously postponed till our next, especially as we have already alluded to a quotation of Cardinal Wiseman, in another article (see p. 84), which we desire to give him and his friends an opportunity of explaining before making any further attack upon the character of his authorities.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We would request our correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

All letters to be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-st. To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal, which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

* Opera Justin. Paris, 1742; Præfat. Pars. ii., cap. iv., p. xxii. † Exod. xxxiv. 14; Ps. xciv. (xcv) 6; 1 Sam. (1 Kings) xv. 25; 2 Kings (1 Kings) xvii. 36; Heb. i. 6; Acts xviii. 7, 13, xix. 27.

‡ Bened. Ed. Paris, p. 51.

§ Bened. Ed. p. 54.

* του αληθεστατου και πατρος δικαιοσυνης και σωφροσύνης . . . ἀλλ' ἐκείνόν τε και τον παρ' αὐτου υἱον ἐλθόντα και διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα και τον των ἄλλων ἐπομένων και ἐξομολογούντων ἀγαθὸν ἀγγέλιον στρατόν πνευμα τε το προφητικον σεβόμεθα και προσκυνούμεν.

Et cōstitutum quidem nos talium qui habentur Deorum esse expertes et atheos, s.d. non verissimi illius Dei; Paris videlicet justitiae et temperantiae et virtutum altarium; verum hunc ipsum et qui ab eo venit, atque hæc nos et aliorum sequentium et assimilatorum bonorum angelorum exercitum docuit Filium et Spiritum Propheticum colimus et adoramus, cum ratione et veritate venerantes, atque unicuique discere volenti et edocui sumus, candidè tradentes.—Justin Martyr, Apologia Prima, p. 11, cum notis Thiribii, 1722.

¶ Any one who desires to investigate the matter further will do well to consult Bishop Kaye's excellent work on Justin Martyr, p. 53 (Second edition, London, 1836); and Mr. Tyler's Primitive Christian Worship, p. 107 to 114.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JULY, 1854.

THE connection between personal interests and systems of opinions has ever proved the greatest source of intolerance, as well as the greatest obstacle to the progress of truth in the world.

It is this clashing with their personal interests which has so often led the priesthood to represent a departure from their dogmas as the worst of crimes, and made them so ready to defend, by other than intellectual means, any doctrines with which their interest, power, and importance are closely interwoven.

We can scarcely, therefore, be surprised that the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland should avail themselves of all the means in their power to deter the laity from reading any publication likely to promote discussion as to the true nature and character of their authority, or the truth and accuracy of the doctrines which they teach.

That they should iterate and reiterate in private to individuals, and in public in their chapels—in neither of which ways it is possible for us to join issue with them—that our journal is a tissue of lies and calumnies, is no more than we expected; and the vagueness and sweeping character of the assertion constitute, perhaps, its best refutation.

To meet charges of such a nature by counter assertions, that we have never wilfully stated a single falsehood, or distorted a truth, would, of course, carry no additional conviction to the mind of any one, and we shall not, therefore, waste time, by a vain attempt to persuade those whose prejudices induce them to condemn unheard all who differ with them.

We cannot refrain, however, from quoting a passage from the celebrated Pascal, when defending himself against the calumnies propagated by the Jesuit Fathers against the Jansenists:—

“Other sorts of slander are rather too easily discredited; but you have those of a more subtle character, in which you abstain from specifying particulars, in order to preclude your opponents from getting any hold, or finding any means of reply—as for example, when Father Brisacier says that ‘his enemies are guilty of crimes which he does not choose to mention,’ would you not think it were impossible to prove a charge so vague as this to be a calumny? An able man, however, has found out the secret of it, and it is a Capuchin friar, Fathers—Father Valerian, of the house of the Counts of Magnis. He had happily succeeded in converting Prince Ernest, the Landgrave of Hesse-Rheinfels; your Fathers, however, seized, as it would appear, with some chagrin, at seeing a sovereign prince converted without their having had any hand in it, immediately wrote a book against the friar, and, also, circulated a letter against him, in which they said—‘Ah! we have such things to disclose as will galling you to the quick! If you don't take care, we shall be forced to inform the Pope and cardinals about it.’ This manoeuvre was pretty well executed, and, I doubt not, Fathers, but you speak in the same style of me; but take warning from the manner in which the friar answered it in his book, printed last year at Prague—‘What shall I do,’ says he, ‘to counteract those vague and indefinite insinuations? How is it possible to refute charges which have never been specified? Here, however, is my plan—I declare, loudly and openly, to those who have traduced me, that if they do not discover these crimes before the whole world, they are notorious slanderers, and most impudent liars. Come forth, then, mine accusers! and proclaim your lies upon the house tops, instead of telling them in the ear, and keeping yourselves out of harm's way by so telling them. In the meantime, I shall content myself with declaring MENTRIS IMPUDENTISSIME. If the charges they make against me be true, let them prove it; otherwise they stand convicted of falsehood, aggravated by the grossest effrontery. Their procedure, in this case, will show who has the right on his side. I desire all men to take particular observation of it; and beg to remark, in the meantime, that this precious cabal, who will not suffer the most trifling charge, which they can possibly repel, to lie upon them, make a show of enduring, with great patience, those from which they cannot vindicate themselves, and

conceal, under a counterfeit virtue, their real impotency. My object, therefore, in provoking their modesty by this sharp retort, is to let the plainest people understand that, if my enemies hold their peace, their forbearance must be ascribed, not to the meekness of their natures, but to the power of a guilty conscience. Thus, has this honest friar discovered the secret of shutting your mouths; and it must be employed, on all occasions, when you accuse people without proof. We have only to reply to each slander as it appears in the words of the Capuchin, *mentiris impudentissime*—you are most impudent liars."

Without, however, resorting to the expedient of the good Capuchin friar, there are some practical tests, we think, by which intelligent readers, however distrustful of those with whom they have been taught to differ in matters of religion, will find no difficulty in satisfying themselves, whether our pages are trustworthy, or whether we are guilty of the charges of deliberate falsehood and calumny, with which those whom they have been accustomed to consider their spiritual guides have so unsparingly and unjustly assailed us.

First, we would call the attention of our readers to the fact, that we have never yet, though two years and a half in active and most extensive circulation, been once detected in a false statement, a garbled quotation, or any other intentional unfairness, either in argument or assertion. Our readers, who have traced our progress, cannot fail to have perceived that we have been, all through, most carefully watched by men, most able and willing to expose the slightest inaccuracy, or semblance of unfairness of any species whatsoever; and who would willingly displace us from the high ground on which we have taken our stand, as champions of fair play, and candid inquiry, and expose and disgrace us for insincerity and untruth, if they could.

If, therefore, we have not been detected, or held up to the deserved infamy which awaits dishonesty and imposture, it is not owing to our opponents being ignorant of what we write, or being either unable or unwilling to defeat us, if it were possible to do so, by so summary a method as that of exposing, in any way, the conduct of our journal as discreditable to the character of its conductors.

Secondly, we would remind our readers that not one of the able Roman Catholic writers who have come forward, so earnestly, to defend the doctrines of their Church in our pages, have ever charged us with falsehood or fraud, while they have done their best to confute our arguments, and establish their own.

Thirdly, not a single Roman Catholic periodical has yet ventured to impeach a single statement we have made, or authority we have cited, though some of them have, in general terms, reiterated against us their wholesale charges of falsehood, calumny, and blasphemy, with all the virulence and foul-mouthed invective which the English language can supply.

One charge only has ever been made against our paper, which is at all of a tangible character, and that is, that its title is a false one, and calculated to deceive an unwary reader.

Upon this we would say a few words, and a very few will suffice for our complete justification—for, in our judgment, we think we could not have chosen a title more suitable.

As to its having misled a single reader, we boldly call on our opponents to point out a single number from the commencement of our labours, which could have left any reader in doubt whether the conductors of it were members or opponents of the Church of Rome. That we were dissentients from the Church of Rome, though candid and moderate opponents, ready to hear and discuss all that could be said in her favour, and anxious only to discover and lead others into truth, was apparent to all. The most bigoted monopolist of the title Catholic, never was or could have been led into misconception as to our real views and convictions.

We have, again and again, disproved the right of any denomination of Christians, however numerous, to arrogate to themselves *exclusively* the title of Catholic or Universal. We think the Greek Church, the Roman Church, the English Church, the Lutheran Church, are all branches (though some of them corrupt branches) of the one Catholic Church; but none of them alone, exclusively, has a just claim to arrogate to itself that venerable title; and it is because we would permanently record, in the most practical manner, our continued protest against the ill-founded claim of any *particular* Church to be the *whole* Church of Christ; that we deliberately selected a title which claims for ourselves, while it concedes to our Roman Catholic readers also, the title to which we think both entitled, of members of the *Catholic* Church of Christ. We ourselves claim, in the language of the Liturgy and prayers of the Church of England and Ireland, to be members of the "one Catholic and Apostolic Church," and we never will consent to waive that title, while we hold fast to the only ancient creeds and symbols of the primitive faith—creeds which we hold in common with all Catholics (Greek or Roman) throughout the world.

In the very first number of our paper, we defended our claim to the title when stating, explicitly, that there were several doctrines which all sincere Roman Catholics and Protestants hold in common, which might, with truth, be called Catholic (*i.e.*, universal) opinions, and demonstrated that our Roman Catholic brethren could not, consistently, deny the title of Catholic to any who are sincere believers in the Trinity, without setting at defiance both the voice of antiquity, and the language of one of the authorized formularies of both Churches—the Athanasian Creed—which is clear and explicit, where it says, in terms the most express, "This is the Catholic faith, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity."

If the Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland or England have any other charge to make against us, let them bring it forward manfully, in a fair spirit, and we shall rejoice to discuss the matter with them with Christian forbearance and candour; if they will not do so, but continue their present vain and inconsistent attempt to ignore our existence, while, at the very time, they are falsifying their own policy by denouncing us as liars, we shall be driven at last to retaliating on them by saying, in the words of the honest Capuchin friar, "*mentiris impudentissime*."

Correspondence.

IS THE DOCTRINE OF PURGATORY TAUGHT BY THE EARLY FATHERS?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.*

SIR—I find the subject of Purgatory revived in your April number, by a Mr. John Duffy (No. 28, p. 52). The question was raised in your journal, Vol. I, Nos. 6 and 7, when you published a letter of "A Catholic," who wished "to know, once for all, if it (Purgatory), was or was not the doctrine of the Church of Christ in the first ages." He limited his inquiry to the writers of the "first three centuries." Mr. W. C. Search undertook to supply the information required (see Vol. I, No. 7, p. 81): and among the alleged authorities he quoted Tertullian, as follows:—

"I. Among the apostolical traditions received from the Fathers, we have oblations for the dead on the anniversary day.—*De Corona Militis*, p. 209."

"II. In his treatise on Monogamy, cap. x., p. 155, he advises his wife, 'Pray for the soul of your departed husband, entreating repose to him, and participation in the first resurrection—making oblations for him on the anniversaries of his death.'"

In your observations on these two passages, you state that the doctrine of Purgatory is not proved by them, and, therefore, think it unnecessary to inquire whether they "do really allude to Purgatory or not." You seem to

* We have to apologize to the writer of the following valuable letter for so long delaying its insertion. The crowded state of our columns must plead our excuse.—Ed.

admit that Tertullian believed in Purgatory after he became a heretic; that he learned the doctrine from an acknowledged heretic, Montanus; and the books from which the passages in question are cited were both written *after* he became a heretic. Every candid inquirer after Catholic truth must admit this to be a sufficient reply to the citations of Mr. W. C. Search. Mr. John Duffy, however, recurring to this subject, again quotes one of the above passages from Tertullian, and again in his (Tertullian's) book, '*De Corona Militis*,' 'We make yearly oblations for the dead.' To Mr. Duffy's citation you observe—"Though this passage might be cited to prove the practice of prayer for the dead in Tertullian's time, it is obvious that it does not bear at all on the doctrine of Purgatory." But as Tertullian speaks of a *custom* then existing in the Church, among some Christians, I think the passages deserve a little further investigation and explanation than that given by you, particularly as more than one great principle is involved in them. From firmly-rooted prejudices and preconceived notions our Roman Catholic lay brethren are too apt to construe silence into a defeat. Your correspondents will still believe, and will re-quote, when opportunity offers, the passages in question as *proofs* that the modern Roman doctrines of Purgatory and praying for the dead *did exist in the third century*. Romanists appeal to these passages as proofs of an alleged historical fact; and you will permit me, therefore, to make a few additional observations as supplementary remarks to your answers.

It will be observed that Mr. Search quotes more fully than Mr. Duffy; I will, therefore, direct my observations to Mr. Search's citation; they will apply with equal force to Mr. Duffy's still more garbled extract.

I. I have to complain of two serious omissions from the first quotation, which very much affect the force and sense of the passage; and first, Mr. Search has omitted the words, "and not enforced by the positive words of Scripture," after the word "Fathers." He gives the page, without naming the edition from which he quotes. But if he consults, among other editions, Edit. Rothomagi, 1662, p. 289, he will find the missing passage. But as I will not accuse Mr. Search of intentional dishonesty, we must take for granted that he has quoted this passage from some Roman Catholic book of controversy. You, sir, have already shown him the danger of relying on such books for proofs, when he comes to measure swords with us, Protestants. (See No. 9, p. 107; No. 10, p. 119.) For their satisfaction, I would refer Mr. Search and Mr. Duffy to the handbook of Romanists—namely, "*The Faith of Catholics*," by Kirk and Berrington. They will find, in page 354, of the edition of 1813, and p. 356, edit. 1830, the passage in question thus translated:—

"Among the apostolical traditions received from the Fathers, and not enforced by the positive words of Scripture, he reckons oblations for the dead on the anniversary day."

The omission of these few words is very significant. Here is an admission, by the author quoted, that the custom in question is *not* enforced by Scripture. Tertullian reckons this among many other ceremonial usages (many of which are wholly relinquished by the Roman Church at the present day) as a matter of *discipline*, and not as a point of Christian faith. The book, "*De Corona Militis*," was written in defence of a Christian soldier, who declined to wear a crown or garland which his companions in arms wore as a direction from the emperor, and as an honour or mark of distinction, when the conduct of the Christian soldier was inquired into. The context of the passage is as follows:—

"It is easy forthwith to demand, where it is written, that we should not be crowned, but truly, where it is written that we should be crowned? for when the opposite party demands the authority of Scripture for our opinion, they, in fact, predetermine that their own side ought to possess the authority of Scripture for theirs. For if it shall be said, that it is lawful to be crowned, because Scripture does not forbid it, with equal justice may it be retorted, that it is unlawful to be crowned, because Scripture does not enjoin it. How shall discipline act? Shall it receive both opinions, because neither is forbidden? or shall it reject both, because neither is commanded? But, it may be said, that which is not forbidden is freely permitted. Yea, rather, that is forbidden which is not freely permitted."

"And how long shall we thus spend our labour to no purpose, while there exists, on our side, immemorial observance, which, by anticipating the ground, has made the principal point in the case. If no Scripture has determined the matter, it is certainly confirmed by usage, which, without doubt, flowed from tradition. For how could anything be frequently practised, if it had not been previously handed down? But thou sayest, even in the holding out of tradition, written authority is to be demanded. Let us inquire, therefore, whether tradition, though unwritten, ought not to be received. We should not hesitate to adopt the negative of this question, were the matter not prejudged by examples of other observances, which we vindicate without any support from writing, by the authority of tradition alone, from thence by the protection of custom."